

**REMARKS/AGRUMENTS**

Reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4, and 12-14, 23-26 and 34-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,128,318 to Sato ("Sato").

Claims 5-11, 15-22, 27-33, 38-44 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Claim 22 has been cancelled.

**CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC §102 (e)**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4, and 12-14, 23-26 and 34-37 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Sato. Applicants submit that claims 1-4, and 12-14, 23-26 and 34-37 are not anticipated by Sato. In regard to the rejection of claim 1, 12, 23, 24, the Examiner has stated in part that:

"the claimed maintaining a synchronization state of a number of components of a distributed system is anticipated by method of synchronizing a "global" cycle master node (Figure 1, element 22) to cycle slave nodes (element 20) in a network. See column 1, lines 35-39 and lines 66-67, column 2, line 1, and column 4, lines 7-14. The claimed synchronization according to a number local clock cycles recorded between successive occurrences of a global synchronization signal provided to the components is anticipated by cycle reset signal asserted at a prescribed rate which is a multiple of one cycle slave node. (7/16/03, Office Action, p. 2)

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is not anticipated by Sato. Claim 1 has been amended to recite the features of claim 22 (which the Examiner stated is allowable). Claim 1 is substantially similar to claim 12 from which claim 22 depends. Thus, applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-11 are not anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) by Sato.

The Examiner also rejected independent claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) for the reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 1. Claim 12 has been amended to recite the features of claim 22 (which the Examiner stated is allowable). Claim 22 has been cancelled. Thus, applicants respectfully submit that claims 12-21 are not anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) by Sato.

The Examiner also rejected independent claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) for the reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 1. Claim 23 has been amended to recite the features of claim 22 (which the Examiner stated is allowable). Thus, applicants respectfully submit that claims 23-33 are not anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) by Sato.

The Examiner also rejected independent claim 34 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) for the reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 1. Claim 34 has been amended to recite the features of claim 22 (which the Examiner stated is allowable). Thus, applicants respectfully submit that claims 34-44 are not anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) by Sato.

For the foregoing reasons, applicant respectfully submits that the applicable objections and rejections have been overcome and that the claims are in condition for allowance.

If there are any additional charges, please charge them to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: September 16, 2003 Sanjeev K. Dutta  
Sanjeev K. Dutta  
Reg. No. 46,145

12400 Wilshire Blvd.  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025  
(408) 947-8200